

Panagiotis (Panajotis) Kondylis - Answers owed and due

- [Home](#)
- [The Political and Man](#)
- [The Philosopher and Pleasure](#)
- [The Philosopher and Power](#)
- [Utopia and historical action](#)
- [The multi-dimensional Enlightenment](#)
- [16th and 17th century utopian constructions](#)
- [Montesquieu and the Spirit of the Laws](#)
- [Marx and Greek antiquity](#)
- [Power and Decision](#)
- [Science, Power and Decision](#)
- [Planetary Politics after the Cold War](#)
- [The Political in the 20th century](#)
- [The German Sonderweg](#)
- [Carl Schmitt's 'Political Theology'](#)
- [Theory of War - Summary Notes](#)
- [An Unfortunate Exchange](#)
- [Answers to 28 questions](#)
- [Answers owed and due](#)
- [Thoughts and Sayings](#)
- [Quotes and longer citations](#)
- [Introduction to Chamfort](#)
- [Introduction to Lichtenberg](#)
- [Introduction to Rivarol](#)
- [Introduction to Pavese](#)
- [Melancholy and Polemics](#)
- [Fotis Apostolopoulos In Memoriam](#)
- [blank page](#)
- ['Panajotis Kondylis' by Reinhart Koselleck](#)
- [Thinking in and of the Decision by Volker Gerhardt](#)
- [blank page 2](#)
- [Introduction to Machiavelli](#)
- [The emergence of dialectics](#)
- [The European Enlightenment](#)
- [The new-times critique of metaphysics](#)
- [Conservatism](#)
- [Theory of War](#)

- [The decline of the bourgeois thought and life form](#)
- [Translations and Miscellany](#)
- [blank page 3](#)
- [blank page 4](#)
- [Translator's Page - Prelude](#)
- [Translator's Page](#)
- [blank page 5](#)
- [blank page 6](#)
- [Readers' Page](#)
- [blank page 7](#)
- [blank page 8](#)
- [blank page 9](#)
- [Not related to PK's writings - only for Rhomioi](#)
- [Further Articles of Interest](#)
- ["Liberal Democracy"](#)
- [Important Announcements](#)
- [A Dialogue between I and S on Positions](#)
- [ATTACKS ON SITE and FINAL THOUGHTS](#)
- [FINAL THOUGHTS 2](#)
- [FINAL THOUGHTS 3](#)
- [FINAL THOUGHTS 4](#)

Disclaimer: Nothing within this page or on this site overall is the product of Panagiotis Kondylis's thought and work unless it is a faithful translation of something Kondylis wrote. Any conclusions drawn from something not written by Panagiotis Kondylis (in the form of an accurate translation) cannot constitute the basis for any valid judgement or appreciation of Kondylis and his work. (This disclaimer also applies, mutatis mutandis, to any other authors and thinkers linked or otherwise referred to, on and within all of this website).

IF YOU DON'T HAVE THE TIME TO READ THIS SLOWLY (AS IF IT WERE A 510-PAGE AND NOT 51-PAGE DOCUMENT) - GOING BACK AND FORTH - AND ENSURING YOU UNDERSTAND EVERY POINT MADE (THE "POINTS" COME THICK AND FAST, ONE AFTER THE OTHER), THEN DON'T START READING IT IN THE FIRST PLACE!!! IF YOU DO READ AND STUDY THIS, AND UNDERSTAND IT, THEN YOU WILL HAVE ENTERED THE "HALLS OF SCIENCE", AND THEN CAN GO BACK TO SUPPORTING YOUR OWN GROUP AND ITS

IDEOLOGY/IDEOLOGIES ETC. - HOPEFULLY WITH BETTER ARGUMENTS -, AND OF COURSE THIS TIME, "IN THE REAL KNOW" ... AND PART OF A CLUB INCLUDING THUCYDIDES, MACHIAVELLI, HOBBS, LA METTRIE, WEBER, P.K. AND ME!!!



[Answers owed and due by Panagiotis Kondylis.pdf](#)

Size : 471.137 Kb

Type : pdf

To be studied with *Power and Decision*, some of the *Answers to 28 Questions*, and along with some of my "YouTube-related" comments on the Readers' Page - if you can stand the swearing and profanities, and can read between the lines.

[[WARNING: whilst some of my footnotes (= nothing to do with P.K.) might be more than helpful to readers (if any), you should avoid at all costs the "anti-Satanic" footnotes whose anathematising purpose is to keep "Satan" and its Representatives (i.e. The Representatives of Satan and Satanic Circus Monkey People) as far away as possible - though all readers (if any) who are not Satanic Circus Monkey People, be they Protestants, Catholics, Atheists, Mohammedans, Hindu Men, Rus Men, Han Men, even Jews, et al., are more than welcome to read P.K.'s texts and to "take" whatever they think will be of use to them, and I suppose even Satanic Circus Monkey People can too, if they have the requisite brain capacity.]]

[[ALERT! ALERT! ALERT!

The text around (before and after) and including my footnote 33, indicates that I

have (probably or most likely) made a (minor?) error on one of my presentations/interpretations of P.K.'s stance regarding value-free descriptive theory in some of my comments throughout this Site.

Personally, I feel it is important to make it quite clear, because the last thing I want to do is misrepresent

P.K. on any matter whatsoever. On the other hand, I've also said many times "Science says (if it

were ever to say...) **DO WHATEVER THE FUCK YOU WANT AND LIKE"** (it does not say, to be absolutely precise, "sit there, do nothing apart from breathe and fart etc., and wait to drop dead"), so my ((relatively?) minor?) error was sort of, kind of atoned for, by me, anyway. But, what is wrong, is wrong and to be frank (and I normally would never want to be a **Filthy Northern European Frank!**), if I fucked up, I

**fucked up, and I was
WRONG!]]**

1998

KARL VORLÄNDER GESCHICHTE DER PHILOSOPHIE 3

re 494

chiavelli

65 113

Ε. Cassirer: δοκίμιο για τον ανθρωπισμό



καλθός

ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗ ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗ

ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗΣ ΚΟΝΔΥΛΗΣ

ΜΕΛΑΓΧΟΛΙΑ
ΚΑΙ ΠΟΛΕΜΙΚΗ

ΔΟΚΙΜΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ

ΘΕΜΕΛΙΟ

Ludger Heidbrink (Hrsg.) Entzauberte Zeit

EDITION ARZENTE
HANSER

[[READ THIS VERY CAREFULLY!!! IF YOU UNDERSTAND THIS, AND THEN UNDERSTAND THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ABSOLUTELY STRICT SCIENCE, AND HAVING TO SOCIALLY-POLITICALLY SUPPORT YOUR GROUP (TRIBE, NATION, CULTURE, ETC.) IF YOU WANT TO BE "A PART OF SOMETHING" DURING YOUR LIFE, THEN YOU ARE IN!!! YOU ARE NOW IN THE KNOW!!! YOU CAN THEN VIRTUALLY FEAST ON ALL THE UNBELIEVABLE INSIGHTS P.K.'s OEUVRE HAS TO OFFER, AND GOOD FOR YOU!!! EVEN IF YOU ARE SOMEONE I DON'T LIKE OR EVEN HATE, WE ARE ALL HUMANS, AND WE JUST HAVE TO ACCEPT THAT SOME WE SHALL LIKE, OTHERS WE SHALL DISLIKE, SOME WE SHALL LOVE, OTHERS WE SHALL HATE, AND OTHERS WE SHALL BE

**INDIFFERENT TOO, BUT WE ALL
SHARE, OR SHARE IN, THE
FUNDAMENTAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL
AND SOCIAL-ONTOLOGICAL
FEATURES OF HUMAN EXISTENCE -
NOTWITHSTANDING THE UP TO
TREMENDOUS DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN INDIVIDUALS AND OR
GROUPS.]]**

"... Theories seek their objectification (that is to say, they ask to become inside society, a Whole, concealing that they are always the expression of a part, an individual or a group), only because they directly or indirectly represent an Ought. The theoretical privilege of the correct description could lay claim to, and acquire, practical significance (meaning) only if the specific weight of pure theory inside society was notable; but it is something below negligible, and if it does not always appear as such, the reason is that many of those who exercise social influence by producing ideology take pleasure in the delusion that they exercise it (such social influence) by producing high theory. Not the theoretical action (the result(s) of an act or acts/the acting) of axiologically free ([[non-normative]] value-free) description of the world in itself, but its publication (an act which is not necessary), begets some reactions and fermentations (zymoses) (i.e. intellectual interactions producing specific kinds of (temporary) results or conclusions) in peripheral circles, being of use, in the end, in a new mobilisation and self-reinforcement of socially dominant normative thought. Thus, things come full circle. If axiologically free ([[non-normative]] value-free) description of the world changed the world and

humans, then they would not have coincided any longer with this description of them (i.e. the axiologically free description of them), that is to say, the axiologically free ([[non-normative) value-free]]) description of the world would have been automatically confuted (negated, cancelled)."

[[TAKE THAT, RETARDS!!!]]

"... When Mr. Georgiou reproaches or rebukes the fusion of the axiological (value(-related)) and of the real level, he forgets not only that the human condition inside the circumstances (conditions) of culture (civilisation) is interwoven so tightly with axiological (value(-related)) preferences, (such that, since even also biological functions obtain an axiological (value(-related)) dimension, no description of it (the human condition) is possible without reference to the form and to the function of values; he also forgets that there are two diametrically opposed ways of separating or distinguishing the axiological (value(-related)) element from the real element: to consider the second (real element) without being guided, lead (or [[otherwise]] directed) by the first (axiological (value(-related))) element: descriptive consideration (the descriptive way of looking at things)), or, to separate or distinguish the first/former (axiological (value(-related))) as the criterion of analysis of the second/latter (real element) (whereupon, the axiological (value-related) (element) excels (surpasses, outweighs) the real (element), and is found at a level higher than the real: normative consideration (the normative way of looking at things)). It appears to me to be obvious which of the two ways is at an advantage with regard to *scientific* criteria, since it can be shown empirically how values are formed and function inside the human condition, however we are not in a position to comprehend that the world and humans would come outside of, i.e. exit, values – except if we ended up also again in theology and Platonism."

Designed by [Arcsin](#)

Make a [free website](#) with